REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are now present in the application. Claims 1-7 and 9-12 have been amended. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 13-20 have been added. Claims 1, 9 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 2, 4 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

Claim Objection

Claim 6 has been objected to due the presence of informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, in which the Examiner's helpful suggestions have been followed, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takisha, U.S. Patent No. 4,768,155. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takisha in view of Gilmore, U.S. Patent No. 4,366,703. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takisha in view of Chang, U.S. Patent No. 6,062,084. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takisha. Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takisha in view of Chang. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 8, which was indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that all of the claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 13-20 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Independent claim 13 recites a combination of elements including "a cross-bar ultrasonic detection device positioned above said detection platform for emitting an plane ultrasonic wave and receiving the ultrasonic wave reflected from the wafer". Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements set forth in claim 13 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, Takisha teach a supersonic flaw detecting system having a probe adapted to emit a supersonic wave towards an object to be inspected (see Abstract). In other words, the probe only can emit a point type supersonic wave, which is inefficient.

On the other hand, the cross-bar ultrasonic detection device of claim 13 can emit an plane ultrasonic wave, which can shorten the detecting time effectively and can detect the flaws in the wafer thoroughly. This feature is not disclosed in Takisha or any other utilized references.

Accordingly, it is believed that independent claim 13 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 13-20 are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/633,414

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Joe McKinney Muncy

Reg. No. 32,334

KM/GH/mmi/asc 2019-0207P

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000